Summary, Fall Meeting
Depository Library Council
Washington, DC
October 19-20, 1992

Monday, October 19, 1992

The Fall 1992 Depository Library Council (DLC) meeting was held October 19-20, 1992 in Room LM-407 of the Library of Congress Madison Building. All fifteen members of the Council were in attendance: Gary Cornwell, Chair, Susan Tulis, Secretary, Sandy Morton-Schwalb, Robert Oakley, Mark Vonderhaar, Miriam Drake, Beth Duston, Kay Schlueter, Richard Varn, John Weiner, William Cassell, William Ellis, Carol Gordon, Judith Rowe, and Jack Sulzer.

Monday morning was an informal preparatory session for Council consisting of updates from Superintendent of Documents Wayne Kelley and Judy Russell, Director, Library Programs Service (LPS). Before the updates, Gary Cornwell, DLC Chair, announced that Council had revised its charter to bring it more in line with what Council is actually doing. It will be available to the public once it is finalized. He also announced that Beth Duston had been elected Chair-Elect of the Council.

Mr. Kelley spoke about the changes in the Sales Program and the Federal Depository Library Program (FDLP) that are currently going on. During his tenure at GPO so far, Mr. Kelley has learned there are many dedicated and capable people within GPO; that the environment around GPO is changing and creating new demands, some of which are conflicting; and that there is stiff competition for scarce taxpayers' dollars as well as limited GPO resources. He concluded that the programs under his supervision needed to manage change, not react to it. Decisions need to be made in the best interests of the most people, not because of a complaint.

Management Changes

As a result, all five top managers accepted the responsibilities of new jobs, and Mr. Kelley has asked a dozen mid-level managers to take on new assignments. These mid-level managers have been asked to take a fresh and inquisitive look at their new areas of responsibility and search for ways to improve GPO's performance.

First, they will review the areas of operations under them for strengths and weaknesses; look for productive areas and roadblocks; look at finances, resources, staff levels and the skills of their staff. Second, they will examine organizational values (the unwritten rules by which the government

> *GPO managers will be change sponsors, change agents, and supporters of change.*

does business) to determine which should be kept and which should be changed. Third, they will create a vision of the future of what their operation should be doing 2-3 years from now. Finally, they will make the changes necessary to make that vision a reality. GPO managers will be change sponsors, change agents, and supporters of change. Mr. Kelley reminded us that change is painful and risky. No one will be asked to implement a change they oppose. GPO's goal is to improve performance and to create an organization that will serve the needs of the American public in the coming years. In many cases there will be no change. GPO's purpose is to make its operations better and Mr. Kelley encouraged us to let him know when that is not happening.

Judy Russell spoke about the staff changes within LPS. John Beadle came in as Deputy Director, LPS, in January, primarily to work with the microfiche backlog. LPS is now shipping things less than 60 days old. Sheila McGarr was moved into Depository Services, where her strengths and experiences will increase the ombudsman role, whether or not LPS fills a specific position with that title. Sheila is retraining the inspectors to answer more questions when out in the field instead of having to compile a list of questions to answer once returning to Washington, DC. Gil Baldwin is heading up a group tentatively called Administrative Services which will be responsible for automation, but whose primary focus is on understanding and managing financial resources.

Tad Downing will bring a fresh look to Cataloging, and has been challenged to have the Monthly Catalog (MoCat) do what the law says, that is, put out records in the month that the publications are issued. He is looking at cooperative cataloging, COSATI conversion, and streamlining the kinds of records used in the MoCat, even if GPO has to come back and finish them as full cataloging records for the purposes of individual libraries' online catalogs. Joe McClane went to the documents area in Sales, to get some cross fertilization between the two areas. Laurie Hall is looking at consolidating some of the cataloging and classification functions, as well as focusing on full integration of ACSIS into LPS activities. Jane Bartlett has been moved to EIDS where she is still finishing up the pilot project evalu██████report.

A comment was made that the community is concerned about these changes, bordering on anger, and there is an inability to understand why these changes have taken place. GPO may need to do more PR on this issue. GPO did say that if these changes resulted in operational problems then it is fair for people to complain; if it is a matter of personalities, then it is not. The community has to trust GPO's management decisions; GPO has to use their managers where they think they can get the best results.

Electronic Initiatives

Ms. Russell also gave an update on the tactical plans for implementing **GPO 2001**. Draft plans are due to the Public Printer by October 30, 1992. Two of the tactical plans fall under Mr. Kelley's supervision: one deals with looking at new electronic and print on demand products and services to satisfy customer agency needs and public desires; the other on development and implementation of electronic capabilities to serve depository libraries, focusing on dissemination responsibilities and product creation.

Ms. Russell outlined the key points of their plan (it will probably be one combined plan): a statement of purpose to identify types of products, types of markets they are trying to serve, and areas of emphasis to be concentrated on. The statement of areas of improvement becomes a task list of things to be accomplished. They are also assembling a list of critical issues, constraints and assumptions; a statement of method or approaches (strategy); specified resources (staff, contracts) needed to commit in the near term. Procedures and methods for amending the plan are being looked at; as well as developing a time frame for major components.

Some of the critical events they see happening are: getting a full staff of 23 for EIDS; further development of a bulletin board; development of a specific product with one agency; refining and improving the bulletin board; doing some market studies (one on agency needs, one on user needs); within a year have a prototype issue of a bimonthly electronic initiatives newsletter which will highlight some of the various activities and opportunities taking place; movement towards Internet connection no later than March 1993; working towards agency partnership; improving order processing and delivery; consolidated customer databases; a local LPS network in FY 94; a preliminary edition of a federal information directory (directory of directories or directory of locator systems) by October 1993. Initially they will look at a paper product with simultaneous release on the Bulletin Board for the federal information directory. It may be a list of locator systems, and not necessarily just electronic ones. GPO does not have a tight design for it yet. GPO may use the Bulletin Board as a place to maintain information about agency bulletin boards since this information does not appear in MoCat.

LPS Budget

Lastly, Ms. Russell gave an update on GPO's budget situation. Although GPO has had increases in the dollar amount, there has been a decrease in the amount of buying power over the last decade. The majority of the gap has been filled in with microfiche. GPO did a needs based budget this year, rather than figuring out how to make do with what is appropriated. They came up with a $32.5 million requirement and an appropriation of $29.1 million. Since printing and binding is the largest portion of GPO's costs, substantive cuts will probably come here. GPO is considering a number of alternatives: putting more things on microfiche, looking at things that might be duplicative, looking at low content things (decals, posters, forms, questionnaires, military base newsletters), looking at less significant things they might avoid printing and distributing so that more important and substantive things can continue to flow.

It is not at all clear that the program structure established 30 years ago is the best possible way to accommodate electronic technology.

GPO has had one meeting with JCP to discuss the budget shortfall and another is planned. Ms. Russell emphasized the fact that with GPO's present resources there are real limits on what they are able to do in terms of new initiatives when they don't have resources to continue to do what they are currently doing. In examining their financial commitments, they will probably break even for FY 1989, but they envision a $1 million shortfall for FY '90. Of the $29 million appropriated for FY '93, up to $2 million can be used to pay for things that were delivered in 1993, but ordered in 1989 or 1990. So in reality, they don't have $29 million for 1993 publications.

GPO is trying to complete a similar analysis for FY '91 and '92, but there are so many outstanding jackets (orders) that it is hard to estimate. A new system has been put in place to get a cost estimate up-front on every jacket as they ride it. Ms. Russell estimates that in a year they will be able to look at a class number and tell you exactly how much it costs them. Remember, GPO cannot overspend their appropriation. If somebody prints through GPO and GPO doesn't have enough money, GPO won't ride the order. There are some things they don't ride now, such as military specifications, patents, etc. In the past, GPO has been fairly nondiscriminatory. There is a difference between what GPO would like to do and what they can afford to do. At least GPO is better equipped to talk to the Appropriations Committee than they have ever been; they have documented their estimates, and the assumption is that GPO will have even better information next year once they have had a full year on the ACSIS system.

Public Printer's Overview

The formal meeting began Monday afternoon with opening remarks by Public Printer Robert Houk. He, too, talked about GPO's budget situation. While he is pleased that they received an increase in the S&E budget, it is still short of their projected need. They have begun reviewing various concepts to optimize the utilization of the budget resources they will have for FY 1993. The appropriations conference report requires the Superintendent of Documents to conduct a study on the feasibility of disseminating information in electronic formats. In doing so, they are to utilize the assistance of the National Distance Learning Center in Owensboro, KY. GPO was not provided additional funding for this project. Even though the WINDO/Gateway legislation failed to pass, GPO is continuing in an electronic direction. They have incorporated the electronic direction into their daily operation. In the meantime, they have a lot of work ahead of them.

Restructuring

GPO is beginning to evaluate how the depository library program can or should be structured to accommodate these methods. It is not at all clear that the program structure established 30 years ago is the best possible way to accommodate electronic technology.

There have already been proposals to restructure the program: Association of Research Libraries (ARL), **Informing the Nation**, satellite transmission in **GPO 2001**. Do these plans and concepts or other plans and concepts have validity today from the point of view of the depository library community? Mr. Houk sees the questions Council will be considering today as moving us into that arena. The questions aren't meant to be rhetorical or academic. They are designed with the practical purpose of transforming the Federal Depository Library Program (FDLP) into an institution that continues to meet its mission in an era of drastically changing technology, limited funding, and increased public need. Mr. Houk doesn't foresee a single simple answer to the problem, but there is every indication that the tools are available for addressing the challenge that faces us.

Impact of Technology

Online technology, networking, and eventually satellite technology offer growing advantages for disseminating an increased amount of information cost effectively. CD-ROMs and a more judicious and effective distribution of traditional formats offer significant

> *Online technology, networking, and eventually satellite technology offer growing advantages for disseminating an increased amount of information cost effectively.*

opportunities for economies in information distribution. Provision of more services through non-government entities, beginning with the current use of microfiche contracting and possibly expanding in new directions, can be explored for promoting information availability. So the seeds of reform are already there. What we want to discuss and nurture are these ideas and others that Council brings to the table. The goal is to provide GPO with input that will be valuable to them as they move forward in improving the FDLP and the critically important service it provides.

Restructuring the Federal Depository Library Program

Question #1:   Should there be a Depository Library Program in the electronic age?
If so, how could the program be structured to fit the realities of the
current GPO budget?

If we are going to talk about restructuring, the first question that needs to be asked is if
there should be a program. That question is particularly relevant right now as technology is
changing because it is raising that question in very fundamental ways. Do we really need a
program with the change to electronic? The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) has
not said that there needs to be a program in the electronic age, whereas others have. We
have heard the following thoughts expressed: Do we need libraries if there are no longer
physical pieces? The program would cost too much money. GPO can't do it. Libraries have
said they don't want it because they can't afford it.

Some of the issues raised have been: If we assume that the sun is setting on the FDLP,
do we want a program in the future? What would be the goals of such a program? Ought
there to be a program, and how would we design it? We can start with the assumption that
there is a role for all the players, but we need to define what GPO's role would be.

Goals of a New Program

1.   Comprehensiveness of access - assume all the information is available through the
program.

2.   Librarians as key intermediaries - to provide meaning and value to the information, as
well as user training and user assistance.

3.   Equity of access.

4.   Tactile nature and browsability of books in libraries.

5.   Library/librarians role in generational/transitional problem with electronics.

6.   Broader vision - people come in looking for something specific and find out about
other government information.

7.   Electronic dissemination - opportunity for economic/agency/staff efficiency; possibility
of print on demand.

8.   Different levels of service in the program for different access to data. Is it possible
that those who select electronic products would have to provide a higher level of
service? Would some libraries cease to receive paper products? Define responsibilities
and incentives for libraries in terms of their collection development.

9.   During the period of transition, depository libraries provide connectivity to network services, federal services, and electronic services that the general public won't have. Local connectivity is not going to be there for some time to come.

10.   Single point of access.

11.   Correlate distribution of resources.

12.   Electronic access can allow searching across different data files (i.e. WAIS).

13.   Still a need for paper products in an electronic age.

Council members did not formally agree whether there should or should not be a program, but since we came up with goals for such a program, the underlying assumption is yes. If we are going to justify a program with a mixture of electronics, a point of presence is needed and the passive access issue needs to be dealt with.

The whole notion of depository was raised since some people think it is an outmoded word; it's not proactive. Members of Council could not come up with something to replace it. However, the question was asked if there shouldn't be a correlation between allocation of resources and their use. Is there a way to measure this so you can get the most bang for the buck? Does it make sense to distribute material if it is not going to be used? But on the other hand, it may make sense to have something that is very expensive even though it has limited use. Electronic products are not necessarily better than paper products and there is still a need for paper even in an electronic age.

Arguments Against the FDLP in the Electronic Age

1. Many agencies are not willing to consign to GPO the dissemination of their data.

2. No one will ever give libraries enough money to make the kind of system we would like a reality.

3. Should there be a program if individuals can connect directly to the information?

4. Some people feel there is no legal authority for such a program.

5. Some people feel GPO is unable or unwilling to carry out such a program effectively.

6. Libraries cannot afford the necessary hardware/software and therefore would be unwilling partners in such a program.

The group reached the conclusion that this program has continuing vitality and life even in the electronic age.

Question #2: What are the goals and objectives of the Depository Library Program? Are these goals consistent with the member institutions? Are the depository libraries also meeting their responsibility to serve the public?

The three major goals of the program as stated in Title 44 were examined. The first is that depository libraries shall be located in each state and congressional district in order to make government publications widely available. Do congressional districts provide the best framework for distributing information to the public? Is the physical location of a library important? As congressional districts change, is there a way to consolidate collections and/or share services and resources? The thrust of change in the program has to come from the bottom up. What changes are they willing to make at the local level? New technology creates elitism. How can access be equitable? If libraries limit access to faculty, staff and students, are these institutions fulfilling their obligations as depository libraries? As Congressional districts change, libraries are added to the system, but there is no mechanism for decreasing the number of depository libraries, or denying a designation.

We can't say how Title 44 of the United States Code is going to be changed, but this issue needs to be addressed. Tension exists between getting political support for the program by putting depository libraries in congressional districts and the economic reality of scarce resources. This is an inherent conflict in the system. If you pull out the prop, that is, designating in congressional districts, then where do you build that constituency and that support? Should there be some rational limit as to how many depositories could co-exist in a physical space?

It is not likely that we will get legislation saying libraries have to give up their depository status. If downsizing is something we are aspiring to, do we want to look at libraries with low selection rates, and offer them an incentive to become a basic resource center? Such a center would get a certain core collection, in exchange for not having to do discard lists, detailed record keeping, etc. What does that do to level of service though? Should GPO be far more rigid in terms of public access? Or should we be getting away from politically focused designations, by reducing what designation means? Perhaps the library could get the designation, with all of the clout, the Senators or Representatives would get what they needed, but GPO wouldn't have the full costs because the library would be designated as something other than an ordinary depository library. Or if there is more than one library in a district, should sharing among those libraries be a requirement? Should there be different requirements for different types of libraries?

It is not clear that decreasing the number of depository libraries would aid the budget shortfall. But it is conceivable that a radical downsizing of the program might affect the budget shortfall. Constituents would be upset and complain to GPO and their congressmen. There may be a danger in making the budget shortfall invisible. There is a need to draw in members of the community who can affect the problem and get them to work on a solution. If you get the libraries to voluntarily scale down their selections, it will be accepted much more readily.

A second goal of the FDLP is to make U.S. government publications easily accessible to the general public and to insure their continued availability in the future. We are still not clear on what depository librarians really want to receive. Is there room for compromise or

is it "all or nothing?" Do we want the libraries to archive this material or do we want them to serve as conduits to other mechanisms? Can libraries service what they receive now? If some of the technical processing standards for libraries were relaxed, would that allow libraries to offer more services? Can the acquisition policies be more flexible to serve changing needs of the clientele?

Is it possible to send the inspectors out to do training on the electronic products, instead of inspecting those libraries that are doing okay? Self-certification for those libraries doing well would free up inspectors for other duties. If there were some incentive or help to libraries in making the transition to electronic formats, it might make it easier all around. The government would gain economic efficiency and would have helped libraries in making the transition.

The question of equity was raised. Over 700 libraries select Congressional reports in microfiche. It costs GPO $100,000 to distribute them, compared to $450,000 for paper copies to just over 300 libraries. GPO is using a lot of resources to let a small number of libraries receive paper copies. If all libraries received microfiche copies, the cost would be $150,000. How do you judge if those 300 are using paper to a far greater advantage? ACSIS will give GPO costs associated with every item shipped. GPO will be able to say how much it cost them to service each library. GPO could give each library a list showing the costs associated with their selections, and ask them to reduce it by 10%. GPO wouldn't care what 10% was cut. We have to remember the basic premise of the law though - to serve the needs of the congressional district.

The third goal of the FDLP is that depository libraries shall make government publications available for the free use of the general public. Do we have agreement yet as to what that means? Do we agree on the definition of government publication and what Title 44 really says? GPO's General Counsel opinion says free means without cost; libraries can charge for photocopying, and duplicating fiche, but not for reading the information. Even though GPO's General Counsel has clearly defined government publications as including electronic data and Joint Committee on Printing (JCP) agrees, OMB might not.

Are the goals and objectives expressed in the mission statements and strategic plans of the individual depository libraries consistent among libraries, with GPO and with the depository library agreement? More research needs to be done to answer this question.

Monday ended with the following observer comments:

- keep in mind as you deliberate that there isn't a federal librarian on Council.
- don't forget the small, poor, public libraries - goal of Congress is that every public library would be a vehicle for public access.
- every member has to feel committed to the program to support it.
- glad to hear about ACSIS - will this create more item numbers to provide more selectivity? (GPO is not sure; the system may be able to handle it, but other procedural things may prevent it.)
- libraries all want different things in the program; don't necessarily want everything in their libraries, but want everything available to them.
- idea of providing more selectivity is very important - could save money.

-   real opportunity of having small selectives still participate but without all the requirements. May be a way to save money on both ends.
-   level of service may vary depending upon constituents - may restrict level of service to some constituents. Lot of wiggle room in regulations.
-   best answer to local problems should come from local areas, not from DLC and certainly not from GPO.
-   we have a regional system that we very rarely use. Regionals need to be given more flexibility. Inspectors should work very closely with regionals.
-   in terms of the public who have complained that their free access has been denied, it would be interesting to see how they define the public.
-   what would happen if instead of asking libraries to scale back on their selections, we scale up, and have more requirements to be a depository?
-   we have been hearing a lot of giving up one in terms of the other. GPO has a bulletin board that they are denying depository libraries access to, because we will get that information in paper, diskette or CD. What about the reverse - if library promises not to take in paper, diskette or CD then would you get cost free access to the bulletin board?
-   program was established in the sixties when there was an educational goal for the program. If you change the structure of the program, you change the name depository, then what does that mean? It would change a number of the requirements. Ownership and caretaking requirements should change too. Not concerned about the availability as much as the accessibility of information. Don't lose role of librarian.
-   every library is associated with an institution, and the goals of the institution will dictate the goals of the program and will be very diverse.

Tuesday, October 20, 1992

Council continued with its formal meeting on Tuesday morning. It was decided that implicit in its discussions yesterday there were a number of basic assumptions which might not be clear to everyone, so they were outlined as follows:

Assumptions Concerning a Restructured Program

1. Information world will be a combination of electronic and print for the foreseeable future (5-10 yrs).

2. There will be a need for information professionals serving the public at the user end. The corollary is that electronic services will not replace the professional for the same period of time (5-10 yrs). There is still a need for intermediaries, although it may be a different type of intermediary.

3. Technology will be there to support the program.

4. User expectations will change and increase.

5. Points of delivery will become more diverse - users coming to the library to negotiate questions may be just one point of access.

6.   Need to continue/further leverage our resources through cooperative ventures since there is not enough money to do what they would like to do to meet the needs.

7.   Connectivity to INTERNET/NREN will be available to all libraries. Network access will be increasingly available to individuals, businesses and other organizations.

8.   Federal/state/local investments in network development will be made over the next 5-10 years.

9.   Information policy issues: the uncertain, conflicting policy environment will probably continue; constraints of Title 44; changes to Title 44 are uncertain. (What you deliver)

10.   Telecommunications issues will also remain uncertain and will be resolved on a much wider scale. This larger issue won't be resolved by the Depository Library Program. (How you deliver)

11.   There is a need to restructure the FDLP.

12.   Some depository libraries will be partners in change; some will not.

13.   The Federal Depository Library Program has value.

Question #3 - What Federal agency dissemination needs are being met through the current Depository Library Program? How well are they being met? How could the current program provide better service? What Federal agency dissemination needs could be met through a restructured FDLP?

John Weiner has surveyed fourteen federal agencies. Some general themes came out: agencies are not particularly familiar with the depository library system, while some felt their needs were being met through the FDLP. Some take a positive, active approach to the FDLP; others felt that use of the FDLP covered their responsibility and they didn't have to do much more. Agencies also believed that the system provides free information access to a broad audience, some members of which have no other resource. Several felt the system provided long term availability, so agencies didn't have to stock the information because it is out there for the public to access. Some felt the system provides an important agency link to specialized communities, such as education.

How well are their needs being met? This is uncertain since many agencies don't know if libraries selected their publications and if they actually received them. Some agencies crafted other dissemination techniques, for whatever reasons.

How could the current program provide better service? Agencies need more awareness about the program; public needs to be more aware of what is in the program; and more direct communication channels between libraries and agencies are needed.

What dissemination needs could be met through a restructured FDLP? A restructured

FDLP could address the duplication between some agencies and the FDLP; and could provide agencies with a greater incentive to consider the FDLP in their planning efforts to modernize their information dissemination and access programs and identify the best delivery mechanisms for their users. Archiving of information and agency expectations still need more discussion and investigation.

Question #4 - What criteria can be developed to measure the effectiveness of the existing Depository Library Program and how can these criteria be applied to models such as the one presented by ARL? What are the implications of maintaining the status quo and making no changes to the current program?

There are many ways of looking at this question; one way is an objective input base. Who gets evaluated? Depositories, not GPO, users, or agencies? Success is determined by looking at some of the elements of evaluation - do you have what you are supposed to have, are you keeping it in a way people can get access to it, is it there or not - all of which are objective measures. If you want to begin an objective outcome analysis of all the areas of the program based on customer components, that would be a completely different analysis.

An objective analysis of the customers should be done incorporating the following questions: Who are they? What do they want? When do they want it? Where do they want it? Why do they want it? How are they going to get it and in what form? Are they satisfied with the service they get and the resources which are available to them? Who are other potential users? What are other potential uses?

Other methodologies could be used to obtain the information - subjective, objective, inputs, outcomes, customer or user opinion, and systemic and organizational analysis.

If you want to evaluate effectiveness, you probably want to evaluate GPO too, besides the public. Other possible points of presence such as kiosks and government offices may also be measured for effectiveness.

Other evaluation components might be strategic plans - do they exist and are they being implemented? Is the program cost-effective? What plans have been made for growth?

Certain implications are involved in maintaining the status quo. The force that drives everything first is money. Is a match between resources and mission even possible? Are people willing to give such resources to you? There may be lost opportunities to provide better service at lower cost. Technological advances are not well managed, because we have differing formats, differing capabilities in different libraries, and unevenness in quality of service in different libraries.

The rest of the discussion on the question centered around an evaluation of the users. We need to determine what data already exists (i.e. raw data from the Hernon-McClure study of users), explore various avenues to collect data (i.e. Federal Depository Conference, academic institutions, large public libraries, focus groups, GODORT), determine what data we want, how reliable we want it, how much money we are willing to spend, and develop a plan to do this. Council may be able to include 2-3 questions on two surveys that are

currently being done of certain segments of the depository library community. We do have to be concerned about getting piecemeal data which might not be useful.

Question #5 - Various critics of the Depository Library System have proposed alterative models such as the creation of a national collection or a system of "super-regionals" or electronic depositories to help relieve some of the problems associated with the current system. What are the ideal characteristics of these alternative structures and what criteria can be used for their analysis?

Council reviewed the problems with the current system to know why they are even talking about restructuring. Not everything that should be in the system is currently available through the system, because of fugitive publications and information. Service levels vary from library to library. Many regionals are not capable of handling the materials they currently receive. Funding for all facets of the current program is currently experiencing cuts, threatened cuts, or stagnation. There is currently not enough consolidated statistical information available to show who uses depositories, how depositories are responding to user needs, and what kind of return on its investment the U.S. government is getting from funding the depository program in terms of the value of public information and access. Electronic products require staff training and new procedures to be disseminated and used effectively. They also cause extra expenses for GPO and the libraries, thus further taxing limited resources.

Most of the approaches that have been suggested in the past stress a "level of services approach" that formalizes what is already happening in different depository libraries in the system. Maybe by looking at some of these alternatives we could turn a weakness in the system into a strength by tying an individual library with that particular library's users, their particular needs, and the expertise that is available. It would also tie those smaller libraries into a system whereby they could have a very specific role in contacting another library with a higher level of expertise, access to products, and available service.

Some Ideal Characteristics of a Restructured System

1. Participation of "have-nots" in the system by having some items available locally, but more importantly, focus on their position as an access point to information and expertise available at another level in the system.

2. Use of limited funds to insure the biggest return on investment - some libraries would have access to more materials, training, etc., and therefore, more funds would be spent on those collections; but the information and expertise would be shared on a wide basis within the libraries' jurisdictions.

3. An integral factor in the system working well is close cooperation between information creators (agencies), information disseminators (GPO), and information access points (libraries) to insure that the mission of the depository program is kept in sight and that information/products are used to their full potential.

4. Adequate training and expertise must be planned and budgeted at some level within the system.

5. Access to all materials at some level within the system and a quick, efficient mechanism to get information or materials to other access points within the system must be provided. We need to know that if we call someone else in the system we will be able to get help.

Three Possible Alternative Structures

NATIONAL COLLECTION - It might help to get more fugitive documents into the system if only 2-3 copies were needed. It would help the regionals in that not everyone would have to keep everything sent. This would be a very labor intensive and expensive level of service, but it might free up some funding at other levels that could help maintain this structure.

SUPER-REGIONAL - This concept is based on a geographic distribution, dictated possibly by GPO. This mechanism could more fairly allocate the resources within a region. Each super regional library would provide service to approximately five contiguous states. The same level of service would be provided as by the national collection but just to those states in the region. This assumes a lot of sharing between super-regionals. Institutions should demonstrate ahead of time both agreement and ability to serve in this function. This would prevent a library's being designated as a super-regional without having the ability to provide the services needed in this kind of system. A question was raised as to what incentive exists for a library to be a super-regional. There might be financial support to be a super-regional, as well as extra training. Super-regional responsibilities fall into 3 areas: dissemination (electronic/paper/microfiche products), archiving, and training. A super-regional would serve as the Internet/NREN node for the region. It might also serve as a place to store large amounts of data since we can't necessarily rely on the National Archives to do this. The concern was raised that the thrust of electronic dissemination is just the opposite of consolidation into super-regionals. Supporting access to information might not need to be done in a super-regional structure.

ELECTRONIC DEPOSITORIES - Under this plan libraries would be set up to take all electronic materials, and the libraries would develop the technical expertise to handle the materials. This too would be very labor intensive and costly, but benefits would be realized as these libraries develop the background and know-how to help other libraries.

Criteria for Analysis of New Structure

1. Does the structure meet the information needs of citizens of the U.S. and the dissemination needs of federal agencies?

2. Does the structure meet the requirements of the FDLP as set out in Title 44 and any new legislation that deals with this topic?

3. Does the structure provide equitable, no-fee access?

4.   Does the structure impose additional costs on the end user?

5.   How is the program funded? Is it cost-effective?

6.   How fast can you get information from one of the alternative structures to a depository library or individual?

7.   How well does the new system evolve from the established system? Can all current participating libraries remain a part of the system at some level if they so choose?

8.   How is training and expertise built into the system? At what level? At what funding?

9.   Is the system accessible to all user groups? Are we taking account of urban/rural, academic/business, different geographical regions, etc.

10.   Are all pertinent documents/products accounted for at some place in the system?

11.   Is there a mechanism for gathering information that provides statistical data on how the program is serving users, who is served, etc.

12.   Is system compatible with GPO strategic planning activities?

Tuesday morning ended with the following observer comments:

- paper will continue to exist and be needed.
- a joint regional by subject specialty may disperse information in a more equitable manner. Various libraries have already developed subject expertise and collections depending upon their clientele.
- WORM technology is great, but it is still expensive.
- It may be hard to find people to volunteer to serve in the super-regional role. A lot of sharing between libraries already exists and we should tap into that network.
- Council didn't touch on marketing issue enough. There is a need to market the FDLP at the local level or the public won't support the system.
- how is the Council going to involve the depository library community in this discussion of restructuring?
- we need to determine what our shared goals are.
- the GODORT agency liaison program probably should be coordinated with GPO's activities.
- it is important to have Spring DLC meeting adjacent to or at the same time as the Spring Federal Depository Conference, so that you could do focus groups, find out what is being used and how, etc.
- it is important to include potential users when considering restructuring the program.
- remember that the more you provide, the more demand there will be.
- this is the most promising Council meeting in the past decade. The issues really haven't changed, but the viewpoints of the members looking at them have changed.
- don't try to do everything at once. Take some opportunities, look for priorities, and do what you can to start building within the next 2 years, which is probably the optimum

time when people in Congress really are going to be interested and energized and will want to do something about it.

FOLLOW-UP SESSION

A Communications Subcommittee was established consisting of the following members of Council: Sandy Morton-Schwalb, Chair, Jack Sulzer, Carol Gordon, and John Weiner. Mr. Kelley sees this committee as an ad hoc committee, not a permanent one, with volunteers who have the time and interest. Wayne also sees the Subcommittee providing continuity of Council discussions, so there is follow-up and continued discussion. This Subcommittee will be looking at such things as:

- communications from GPO to the depository community.
- what ways can this be accomplished and enhanced?
- is GODORT one mechanism GPO can use?
- are there others?
- what about communication with federal agencies?
- what about communication with the public, promoting or marketing the FDLP?
- what about communication with other groups such as the Solomon Islands group?
- are there other groups not mentioned that we should be communicating with?
- what about communication between depositories?
- what are the mechanisms and processes for GPO to improve and open up communications?
- what would GPO get out of it?

A second Subcommittee was established to handle the details of doing a written report from this meeting, consisting of Bob Oakley, Chair, Susan Tulis, Beth Duston, Gary Cornwell, and Mark Vonderhaar. Council felt it was important to record what transpired during this meeting, as well as to answer some of the questions raised here. This report could also serve as a basis for discussion at focus groups, stakeholders conference, Federal Publishers Committee meeting, GODORT meetings, or any other time interested parties are available. Council will try to have a tentative draft of the report available in April. All Council members will probably be asked to contribute to certain parts of the report, with the Subcommittee doing the outline and final editing.

Outline of Report

1. History and background of the program.
2. Why is restructuring an issue - Council assumptions about program.
3. Specific models, including ideal characteristics of a restructured program.
4. Process for the future.

There was much discussion about having a stakeholders conference in the spring to review this document, but nothing was finalized. There was also much discussion about utilizing focus groups as a way to get suggestions, criticisms, and ideas about the report.

Mr. Kelley said that while it is appropriate for Council to ask GPO to think about focus groups, it is up to GPO to determine if it is feasible for them to come up with resources or get resources to do it.

Council has continually talked about the need to do a survey of the users of depository libraries. Two surveys are being done within the next few months and we have the opportunity to include 1-2 questions on each. Ridley Kessler, Bill Sudduth and Mike Von Fossen are surveying the Regional libraries and will include 1-2 questions. Gary Cornwell will work with them on what questions to ask. Steve Hayes is conducting a survey of 350 depository libraries. Council gave Steve the sense of what we want asked and he will come up with the specific questions. The two things mentioned were: 1) what are ten titles most used by your library and in what format? 2) outreach - what types of things are you doing?

Lastly, it was suggested that the Spring meeting be held in conjunction or adjacent to the Federal Depository Conference. However, no one had a suggestion as to how to do this without keeping people in Washington for 10 days or having GPO staff working on a weekend.

Submitted by:

Susan E. Tulis
Secretary

Data Errors on Census STF 3A CD-ROM

The Bureau of the Census recently notified the Library Programs Service (LPS) that there are data errors on one **Summary Tape File 3A** CD-ROM for Los Angeles County. There is one bad sector, Tables H 45-52.

Bibliographic and LPS shipping information on the CD-ROM appears in the table below:

SuDoc #	Item #	Title	Shipping List #	Shipping List Date
C 3.282/2: CD 90-3 A-05/992-3	0154-F-01	1990 Census of Population & Housing, Los Angeles ...	92-0030-E	11/6/92

The Census Bureau will provide a corrected version of STF 3A. Once your library has received the corrected disc, please destroy the earlier version.

Update to the List of Classes

December 2, 1992   1992-13

Class no.	Item no.	Change/Notice
EP 2.3/4:	0473-A-11	Labcert Bulletin (irregular). New
L 38.19/4:	637-M-01	Metal/Nonmetal, Surface and Underground Fatalities. New. Combines Metal/Nonmetal Underground Fatalities (L 38.19/2) with Metal/Nonmetal Surface Fatalities (L 38.19/3).
L 38.20/5:	637-K-01	Coal, Surface and Underground Fatalities. New. Combines Coal Underground Fatalities (L 38.20/2) with Coal Surface Fatalities (L 38.20/3).
Y 3.N 95:	1089-A-2	National Nutrition Monitoring Advisory Council, Reports and Publications. New

Whatever Happened To . . . ? ? ?

December 2, 1992   1992-11

Class no.	Item no.	Status
A 1.76:693	0003	Principles of Insect Parasitism Analyzed from New Perspectives. The Agriculture Dept. cannot provide additional copies of this publication. Under 44 U.S.C., §1903, LPS cannot reprint. No rain checks can be filled.
A 13.13: B 63/3/992	0085	Lucky Peak Nursery. The Agriculture Dept. cannot provide additional copies of this publication. Under 44 U.S.C., §1903, LPS cannot reprint. No rain checks can be filled.
A 13.82/2:	0079-E	How to Recognize and Control Sooty Molds. The Agriculture Dept. cannot provide additional copies of this publication. Under 44 U.S.C., §1903, LPS cannot reprint. No rain checks can be filled.
A 13.88: PNW-GTR-303	0083-B-06	Microcomputer Software for Calculating the Western Oregon Elk Habitat Effectiveness Index. LPS is unable to supply this publication, which includes a floppy disc and is not suitable for microfiche conversion. To obtain copies contact: Pacific Northwest Research Station, P.O. Box 3890, Portland, Oregon 97208-3890.
L 29.16: IR 2/991-92	0749-E	Foreign Labor Trends, Ireland 1991-1992. The Labor Dept. cannot provide additional copies of this publication. Under 44 U.S.C., §1903, LPS cannot reprint. No rain checks can be filled.

Whatever Happened To . . . ? ? ?

December 2, 1992   1992-11

Class no.	Item no.	Status
NAS 1.2:F 87/2	0830-C	**Space Station Freedom.** NASA cannot provide additional copies of this publication. Under 44 U.S.C., §1903, LPS cannot reprint. No rain checks can be filled.
NAS 1.2:SCI 2/11	0830-C	The **NASA STI Program.** NASA cannot provide additional copies of this publication. Under 44 U.S.C., §1903, LPS cannot reprint. No rain checks can be filled.
NAS 1.43:UL 8/2	0830-H-06	**The Extreme Ultraviolet Explorer.** NASA cannot provide additional copies of this publication. Under 44 U.S.C., §1903, LPS cannot reprint. No rain checks can be filled.
PREX 3.11/2: 92-004	0856-A-05	**Chiefs of State and Cabinet Members of Foreign Governments.** The Central Intelligence Agency cannot provide additional copies of this publication. Under 44 U.S.C., §1903, LPS cannot reprint. No rain checks can be filled.
S 9.10:	0899	**Treaties and Other International Acts.** Issues 11426-11435 (June 3-4, 1992) have been received out of sequence. After a "Dear Subscriber" letter is mailed, issues 11426-11435 will be mailed. Issues 11311-11425 have not yet been received.
Y 4.P 93/1: 7/9/AMENDT.2	1004-C	**Government Paper Specification Standards.** The Congress of the United States cannot provide additional copies of this publication. Under 44 U.S.C., §1903, LPS cannot reprint. No rain checks can be filled.

Table of Contents

Happy Holidays to All
From All of Us at LPS